

CACCC Meeting Report

December 4, 2003

Muncie, Indiana

Attendees:

Council members: Chuck Bauer, Paula Yeager, Pete Hanebutt, Frank Keeton, David Dimmich, Doug Metcalf, Doug Allman, Glenn Lange, Gene Hopkins, Brad Thurston
Facilitator: Tom Wasson; Recorder: Jeanne Odaffer; Secretary: Debbie Bray (absent)

Guests: 10-15 members of the public attended various portions of the meeting.

Meeting Agenda Topics:

1. Housekeeping & Meeting Logistics
2. Review/Approval of November Meeting Report
3. Resolving Issues
4. Public Input - Morning
5. Resolving Issues
6. Public Input - Afternoon
7. What Next?

1. HOUSE KEEPING AND MEETING LOGISTICS

- A discussion to clarify that all the council's reports and discussions are public record and that council members have the responsibility to keep their constituents informed.
- The format for the final report is to be discussed during the "What Next" agenda item
- Discussed how we are progressing; council decided to continue to proceed using the same process as in past meetings: Work on one issue at a time and through discussions, generate ideas, refine and then have a subcommittee write draft statement for review and further refinement.
- November meeting report:
 - Preston - miss spelled name
 - Defer until after lunch to allow for review

2. RESOLVING ISSUES

Reviewed the draft statement about Rehabilitation of deer

- Rehab: define how long records deer maintained. "10 yrs by the rehabilitator with annual report from rehabilitator.
- "Released within county with permission of land owner"
- Permanent tag – "Rehaber" tag
- Visually identifiable tag

- Unique tag given by DNR
- Will be rewritten by Doug M. and Glenn and provided to council

Reviewed Draft Statement about Possession of Cervids as pets:

- Private ownership
- Only white-tailed?
- Presently must be registered with BOAH for other than white-tailed
- Attorney to BOAH said regulations should run along activity line.
- Could be two sets of activities engaged in.
- Same rules for all cervid species?
- All cervids?
- By activity?
- Finance is big issue – Committee needs to be aware and offer possible solutions to pay agencies costs
- 1) Activity of all Cervid, authority of DNR – 2) DNR only permit deer and elk and set rules for husbandry practices (density, feed, etc)
- Charge fees to cover permitting, regulating etc.
- Propose funding
- Grandfather in existing individuals?
- Proposal would phase out cervids as pets over time
- DNR proposing only white-tailed deer & elk if add other cervids problem with funding

Need to Define: 1) “Pet” farm 2) “Commercial” farm

Commercial: Economic gain

Pet: Only to look at. No selling of any part or by product of animal for gain.

- Clarification of selling – NO SELLING of any kind
- If owner chooses to sell, the owner & buyer both need permit
- No more gamebreeder permits for pets
- Do Not Limit Species, say ALL cervids
- Proposal designed to phase out animals as pets (cervid). To sell need gamebreeders permit and other rules in place for this.

- Under Proposed new rule Existing Pet Owners would have two choices:
 1. Don’t sell and don’t breed can remain pet owners
 2. If allow to breed or sell animals they would have to have gamebreeders permit.

Doug M. Proposed “Accepting recommendation as presented” no vote taken, further proposal made.

Second Proposal: DNR have management of all cervide native to lower 48 states. Strike “white-tailed and elk”. Council agreed in principle, Glenn L. and Doug M. will adjust proposal language accordingly and bring back to Council.

Review of draft statement on Fencing of Public Cervids:

- Insert “Work out a plan” remove “management”
- Change “which” to “to contain”
- Separate paragraph into two paragraphs
- Remove “after reasonable attempt ...”

Paragraph I – should read:

It is illegal to construct a fence or enclosure to contain wild white-tailed deer.

Paragraph II – should read

Prior to fencing or enclosure of land that contains white-tailed deer, the facility must contact DNR. Existing facilities must contact DNR to exclude all free roaming white-tailed deer.

Paragraph III – sentence 2

“DNR will determine the method of exclusion at the property”

Paragraph IV –

“Must be reported within 24 hrs of knowledge of escape of deer.

Discussion of Fence Height

- Fence height 10 feet
- Jim Mitchell was called upon for information regarding fence height with fenced deer was the following States: MO, AL, LA, PA, dealt with the movement of fenced deer and said deer easily cleared 8 ft. fence. They recommended 10 foot fence.
- Suggestion was made to allow an addition of 2 ft. of barbed wire to present fencing.
- 8 ft. fence OK until animal is cornered, then he’ll jump fence.
- It was stated that wild deer have been seen jumping fence with lots of areas within an enclosure to run to.
- Properties that all shooting should have 10 ft. fence.
- The sex drive is a powerful reason to jump fences.
- 8 ft. reasonable and customary – will do the job 99% of the time.
- Former Michigan DNR employee was asked to comment regarding fence. He stated: an 8 ft. fence is cleared easily by deer during rut. 8 ft. fence during the rest of the season should be ok. Michigan instituted a 10 foot fence rule across the board for white-tailed deer. Fence should be 10 ft. of woven wire.
- Michigan rule is “ All new facilities have to have 10 ft. fence. Existing facilities have time to get to specs. If you change 50 ft or more of existing fence it has to 10 ft. fencing.
- Create a “set back” to avoid falling trees on fences,
- Allow for 8 ft. “inside” fencing

3. PUBLIC INPUT – MORNING

1. Concerned with movement of animals and CWD moving into Indiana. Wants to know who is going to take care of the “mess” if it should occur.
2. Is concerned that if BOAH has regulating authority and a disease occurs BOAH has no enforcement ability. Thinks should have careful eye on importation of deer, let DNR have control of situation. Believes “deer farm” is a black eye to Hunting. But can stand black eye NOT disease. General taxpayer, not hunter, should bear cost of cleaning up problem if it occurs.

Lunch Break

November Meeting Report: the report was approved with changes for posting on web.

Page 5 “Livestock and slaughter” will be rewritten and inserted for the November report by Doug M.

4. RESOLVING ISSUES

Fencing continued:

- 10 ft. woven fence perimeter fence for captive Cervids.
- Grandfather present farms with the caveat that if they replace more than 50 foot of fence they would either have to put 10 ft. fence or 2 - 8 foot fences with no less than 10 feet but no more than 25 ft. apart.
- Different heights for elk?
- Jim Mitchell will get back to us regarding white-tailed vs other cervid (fence heights).
- When is maximum time to upgrade? 10 yrs/5yrs
- DNR can modify other species if they choose.
- New facilities vs. existing facilities – Jim Mitchell will investigate other states regulations and recommendations
 - A. 10 ft. high tensile game fence for new facility. B. Modified 8 ft. plus 2 ft for existing . (14 ft. post)
- Time frame to update 7 yrs?
- Gate – high tensile? Double gating?
- Tree falling – High tensile Council wants information on qualities of fence. Brad T. to bring info at next meeting.
- Set back requirements for trees?
- Council wants to provide for “power to do something if facilities ignore requirements. Ex. 1st time large fine. 2nd time out to business. Make Class “D” felony.
- At time of “Proposal” ask for penalty (Glenn L. – Enforcement)
- Chuck to provide a rewrite of Fencing statement

Regulatory Issue: A continuation of discussion in November

- Management: DNR has authority over management (Everything/All) aspects of white-tailed deer. BOAH does not want animal health part or husbandry of white-tailed deer.
- DNR has management authority. Define Management Authority: a. hunting; b. live stock management. Define limits
- DNR has management authority (**Council Ok'd**)
- BOAH Manages issues of Health only. As long as statute stays the way it is.
- No penalty/consequence for not following BOAH rules for registration, importation of animals. Presently a misdemeanor legally
 - Need to increase penalty – requested by Council
 - As relates to Article 22 Care and Survival be joint activity between DNR and BOAH reference health and disease
- DNR has authority to give permission to possess white-tailed deer and cervids (private and public) other resources needed to work with “other cervids” MUST FIND FUNDING
- Defining limits: 1. Fencing; 2) Inventory (# of animals); 3) Identification; 4) Record keeping; 5) Hunting; 6) Possession/permits. At least these, DNR to regulate. **OK'd by Council**
- Doug M. stated in the near future (3 to 5 yrs) the USDA will require identification of two kinds of cervid tags.
 - External and suitable to species (on every animal)
 - Electronic chip (on every animal)
 - If animals not in inventory owner will not be able to move the animals (buy, sell , semen ,urine etc.) intrastate nor interstate
 - BOAH amenable to sharing data base with DNR for information. Common documents for IDNR and BOAH ---**Ok'd by Council**
 - USDA to publish requirements
 - Hunting
 - Possession permits
 - USDA to publish requirements – Council to discuss January Meeting.

Proposal: Allow for BOAH inspected slaughter of Cervids in Indiana. Meat disposed in proper legal BOAH manner.

- Ok if taken to slaughter plant alive
- If BOAH goes to farm, the animal has to be killed by Plant employee with Vet. In attendance. Vet calls plant with serial number, age, sex weight, etc. so arrives at plant verified.

Discussion:

- Statewide not herd by herd
- Can be farm animals only or Can hunt animal only - NOT BOTH
- Hunted animals are not slaughtered
- If we can't come to agreement we have failed our charge and need to seriously think and discuss high fence hunting
- Suggest next meeting discuss hunting issue.
- Type of hunts different, need to discuss how, where, how much, should be considering these items.
- Devote whole next meeting to hunting issue.

7. WHAT NEXT:

Council Agreed to have Cervid Industry provide a "Straw man" of how hunts would take place and this document should NOT become public document until Council has opportunity to discuss next time we meet. We agree to hold this document close and share only with our Leadership until next meeting.

Logistics:

- Next meeting is Saturday January 17th 9:00 AM – 6:00 PM.
- Glenn Lange will try to get Fort Harrison in lieu of Fort Harrison Doug M. has offered BOAH offices.
- We will have Public Input _ hour before lunch and 1/2 hr before What Next in agenda. If more time is needed we will adjust.
- Glenn and Doug M. to work on Regulatory draft statements
- February 10th & 11th (Tues & Wed) meeting to be held in Jasper at the Holiday Inn if available.

Report Format: Two examples available: Michigan & Indiana. Glenn will provide examples. Council agrees format should be:

Crisp

Bullets

Executive summary – quick 1 page summary

History of what has been done

6. PUBLIC INPUT 5:00 PM:

- #1 Deer are resource. Game farms are “wrong thing to do”. He wants his children to be able to hunt in future
- #2 Hunter Educator – we should teach children wildlife are the property of whole state of Indiana. If we continue on the path of game farms in 50 to 100 years we will be like Europe. No public land. He is opposed to penned hunt for profit.
- #3 Disease is main concern. It is not fair that deer farmer can sell deer and individuals cannot sell theirs.
- #4 Opposed to “canned hunts” wants to keep disease out as long as possible.
- #5 Opposed to “canned hunts”, should be under DNR control
- #6 CWD is a concern. Population of white-tailed deer is big in Southern Indiana. If CWD is introduced it would explode in the deer population in Southern Indiana.
- #7 If CWD comes to Indiana who will pay for eradication; deer farmers or hunters?
- #8 “NO canned hunts”
- #9 Against “canned hunts” wants free ranging deer.